

Response dated 07/15/2005
Response to Office Action dated 04/01/2005

Application No. 09/834,264

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 1, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-13 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508. Applicant has amended claim 3. No new matter has been introduced into the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims based on the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Agraharam et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 (hereinafter "Agraharam"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Agraharam discloses a system in which a telephone number may be used as an alias for an email address. A translation server receives the email addressed to the phone number, locates the user's actual email address and forwards the email to the actual email address.

Independent claim 1, includes the feature of "comparing the destination address to the main and at least one alias electronic mail addresses." Applicant respectfully submits that Agraharam never performs this step. All of the email that arrives at the translation server in Agraharam is addressed to the phone number and all email that arrives at the e-mail server is addressed to the email address. There is no need in Agraharam to perform the step of "comparing the destination address to the main and at least one alias electronic mail addresses."

The Office Action incorrectly alleges that the comparing step is disclosed at Col. 3, lines 51-66. Col. 3, lines 51-66 states:

Once the recipient has registered with translation server 110, an e-mail message addressed to the alias address of that recipient is directed to translation server 10. For example, an e-mail message from a sender at client terminal 101 addressed to 2015558765@email.att.net is forwarded to translation server 110. Translation

Response dated 07/15/2005

Application No. 09/834,264

Response to Office Action dated 04/01/2005

server 110, running a standard and well known Sendmail Daemon program, uses the telephone number address identity, 2015558765, to access database 117. Using that telephone number alias name, server 110 retrieves from database 117 the actual e-mail address associated with that telephone number and the Sendmail Daemon forwards the received e-mail message to that recipient's actual e-mail address. Thus, in the example, the e-mail message addressed to 2015558765@email.att.net is forwarded by server 110 to its corresponding actual e-mail address of steveg@attmail.com.

However, as shown above in the cited section of Agraharam, the cited material fails to disclose the claimed feature of "comparing the destination address to the main and at least one alias electronic mail addresses." There is no need in Agraharam to perform the comparison. Therefore, for at least this reason independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 2 which depends from independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 1.

Claim 3 has been amended by this paper to include the step of "comparing a destination address of an electronic mail message to the main electronic mail address and the at least one alias electronic mail address." Similar to the above remarks regarding independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submit that this claimed feature of independent claim 3 is not disclosed in Agraharam. Claims 4-9 which ultimately depend from independent claim 3 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 3.

Independent claims 10, 12 and 13 each contain a similar feature of "comparing the destination address to addresses included in a database of main and alias electronic mail addresses." As discussed above, Agraharam does not disclose, teach, or suggest this claimed feature. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 10, 12 and 13 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claim 11 which ultimately depends from independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 10.

Response dated 07/15/2005

Application No. 09/834,264

Response to Office Action dated 04/01/2005

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a conversation with Applicant's representative would be useful in the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to call Applicant's representative.

Date: July 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Charles Miller

Registration No. 43,805

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD

10 South Wacker Drive,

Suite 3000

Chicago, IL 60606

Telephone: 312-463-5000

Facsimile: 312-463-5001